APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/834,701	04/12/2001	Tom Ren	REN,01B	5019

7590   04/11/2003

Tim W. Curington
4035 Oakridge Street
Houston, TX 77009

EXAMINER
TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	

DATE MAILED: 04/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/834,701	REN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Cam-Y. T Truong	2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-23_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-23_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-7, 9, 11 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Reilly (USP 6427164) in view of Robertson (USP 6269369).

As to claim 1, Reilly teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving records of individuals from an existing database" as (col. 1, lines 60-67);

"populating a web-based database with the individual records" as (col. 1, lines 60-67; col.

2, lines 1-35). Reilly fails to teach the claimed limitations "creating an access account......by

use of the access account".

However, Robertson teaches the claimed limitations:

"creating an access account for each individual record" as creating a personal data

record for a user (col. 6, lines 60-65);

" transmitting the access account to the individuals" as each first user's personal address

book contains information about each second user who has permission to view information in

the first user's personal data record. The first user to specify which types of data fields from

the first user's personal record to allow to appear in the personal address book of the second

user. This information shows that the system transmits the first user's personal record to

personal address book of each second user (col. 10, lines 1-15; col. 8, lines 10-45);

"enabling remote maintenance of the individual records by use of the access account" as

whenever a second user changes any information in any data field of his data record, the

information in that field is automatically updated in the information database of each first user

whom he has given permission to view the information in that data field (col. 3, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of creating a personal data record for a

user. Each first user's personal address book contains information about each second user

who has permission to view information in the first user's personal data record. The first user

to specify which types of data fields from the first user's personal record to allow appearing in

the personal address book of the second user. Whenever a second user changes any

information in any data field of his data record, the information in that field is automatically

updated in the information database of each first user whom he has given permission to view

the information in that data field to Reilly's system in order to prevent a user to update a

personal account without permission.

As to claim 2, Reilly teaches the claimed limitation "the records are received by transfer

across an electronic link" as (col. 8, lines 30-40).

As to claim 3, Reilly teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the electronic link is electronic

mail" as (col. 8, lines 30-40).

As to claim 4, Reilly teaches the claimed limitation " electronic link is selected from

satellite systems, cable systems, direct modem connections, network connections, VPN

connections, or Intranet connections" as (figs 1&2).

As to claim 5, Reilly teaches the claimed limitation " the populating of the web-based database with the individual records further comprises automatically mapping the records" as (col. 3, lines 20-40).

As to claim 6, Reilly teaches the claimed limitation " wherein the populating of the web-based database with the individual records further comprises manually mapping the records" as (col. 3, lines 20-40).

As to claim 7, Reilly fails to teach the claimed limitation "wherein the access accounts are generated automatically". However, Robertson teaches whenever a second user changes any information in any data field of his data record, the information in that field is automatically updated in the information database of each first user whom he has given permission to view the information in that data field (col. 3, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of whenever a second user changes any information in any data field of his data record, the information in that field is automatically updated in the information database of each first user whom he has given permission to view the information in that data field to Reilly's system in order to prevent a user to update a personal account without permission.

As to claim 9, Reilly teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the temporary access accounts are transmitted to the individuals by email" as (col. 2, lines 20-40).

As to claim 11, Reilly teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the remote maintenance occurs across the Internet" as (col. 5, lines 5-35).

As to claim 12, Reilly fails to teach the claimed limitation "wherein the remote maintenance comprises altering the individual records". However, Robertson teaches whenever a second user changes any information in any data field of his data record, the information in that field is automatically updated in the information database of each first user whom he has given permission to view the information in that data field (col. 3, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of whenever a second user changes any information in any data field of his data record, the information in that field is automatically updated in the information database of each first user whom he has given permission to view the information in that data field to Reilly's system in order to prevent a user to update a personal account without permission.

4.   Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reilly in view of Robertson and further in view of Trent et al (USP 5961620).

As to claim 8, Reilly discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "wherein the temporary access accounts are transmitted to the individuals by fax". However, Trent teaches that address book application program maintains an address book information file which contains a default list of default client communication application programs. The default list specifies a default client communication application program for each of a predetermined set of communication types. For example, predetermined

communication types may include fax, video, voice, or e-mail communication type (col. 6, lines 40-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Trent's teaching of communication types may include fax, video, voice or email into Reilly's system in order to allow a system or a user to have more choices in communication with other users or another system.

5.   Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reilly in view of Robertson and further in view of Trent and Despres et al (USP 6434379).

As to claim 10, Reilly discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "the temporary access accounts are transmitted by a media selected from voice mail, physical address, or pager". However, Trent teaches that address book application program maintains an address book information file, which contains a default list of default client communication application programs. The default list specifies a default client communication application program for each of a predetermined set of communication types. For example, predetermined communication types may include fax, video, voice, or e-mail communication type (col. 6, lines 40-50). Also, Despres teaches the network sending a voice message to the terminal (col. 3, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Trent's teaching of communication types may include fax, video, voice or email and Despres's teaching of the network sending a voice message to the terminal into Lee's system in order to allow a system or a user to have more choices in communication with other users or another system.

6. Claims 13-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al (USP 6108691).

As to claim 13, Lee teaches the claimed limitations:

"providing Internet access to the web-based database" as (col. 5, lines 20-35, fig. 1);

" generating passwords for the data records" as (col. 5, lines 1-10);

"providing Internet access to the data records through use of the passwords" as (col. 5, lines 1-20). Lee fails to teach the claimed limitation " automatically distributing the passwords". However, Lee teaches that when processing system receives the user-enter email address, it generate a password and emails that password to the user with the entered email address. Monitor 46 can also generate requests to log in by using names with randomly generated passwords to ensure that a security application in the subscriber database is functioning properly. This information implies that the system distributes passwords to users before allowing users to access the system (col. 9, lines 1-10; col. 5, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lee's teaching of when processing system receives the user-enter email address, it generate a password and emails that password to the user with the entered email address. Monitor 46 can also generate requests to log in by using names with randomly generated passwords to ensure that a security application in the subscriber database is functioning properly in order to prevent a user to update a personal user without permission.

As to claim 14, Lee teaches the claimed limitation "the Internet access to the data records is provided for adding data to the records" as (col.8, lines 40-60; col. 6, lines 15-20, fig. 1).

As to claim 15, Lee teaches the claimed limitation "the Internet access to the data records is provided for amending the data in the records" as (col. 8, lines 40-60; col. 6, lines 15-20).

As to claim 16, Lee teaches the claimed limitation " wherein the Internet access to the data records is provided for restricting further access to the data in the records" as (col.8, lines 20-55).

As to claim 17, Lee teaches the claimed limitation "a database provided for storing customer data records" as (col. 5, lines 1-12). Lee fails to teach the claimed limitations "an account generator provide......use of the access numbers". However, Lee teaches the claimed limitations:

"an account generator provided for creating access numbers for the data records" as the system generates a password for a registered user. This password is stored in subscriber database 51. Monitor 46 can also generate requests to log in by using names with randomly generated passwords to ensure that a security application in the subscriber database is functioning properly. This information shows that the system has included an account generator to create passwords for registered users. Passwords are presented as access numbers (col.5, lines 1-20; col. 9, lines1-10) ;

"a broadcast system provided for distributing the access numbers to the customer" as when processing system 32 receives the user-entered email address, it generates a password and email that password to the user with the entered email address. Monitor 46 can also generate requests to log in by using names with randomly generated passwords to ensure that a security application in the subscriber database is functioning

properly. The above information shows that the system has included a broadcast system to distribute passwords to registered users (col. 5, lines 5-10; col. 9, lines 1-10);

"an update system provided to enable customer access to the data records by use of the access numbers" the system generates a password for a registered user. Once the user has password, that user can then log into the system. When a user first registers and edits his or her main listing, the system requests that user identify himself or herself against an entry in the main database. The user is allowed to move a cursor through the names to select his or her entry. The above information shows that the user uses the password to access his or her data record (col. 5, lines 1-10; col. 8, lines 43-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lee's teaching of the system generates a password for a registered user. This password is stored in subscriber database 51. Monitor 46 can also generate requests to log in by using names with randomly generated passwords to ensure that a security application in the subscriber database is functioning properly. Once the user has password, that user can then log into the system. When a user first registers and edits his or her main listing, the system requests that user identify himself or herself against an entry in the main database. The user is allowed to move a cursor through the names to select his or her entry in order to prevent a user to update data records without permission.

As to claim 18, Lee teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the database is a web-based database" as (col. 5, lines 1-10).

As to claim 19, Lee teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the customer data records include marketing profiles" as (col. 5, lines 25-45).

As to claim 21, Lee teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the broadcast system distributes the access numbers by email" as (col. 5, lines 1-10).

7.   Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Trent .

As to claim 20, Lee discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 17, except the claimed limitation "wherein the broadcast system distributes the access numbers by facsimile".   However, Trent teaches that address book application program maintains an address book information file, which contains a default list of default client communication application programs.   The default list specifies a default client communication application program for each of a predetermined set of communication types.   For example, predetermined communication types may include fax, video, voice, or e-mail communication type (col. 6, lines 40-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Trent's teaching of communication types may include fax, video, voice or email into Lee's system in order to allow a system or a user to have more choices in communication with other users or another system.

8.   Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Trent and Despres.

As to claim 22, Lee discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 17, except the claimed limitation "wherein the broadcast ...., mail, or by pager".   However, Trent teaches that address book application program maintains an address book information file, which contains a

default list of default client communication application programs. The default list specifies a

default client communication application program for each of a predetermined set of

communication types. For example, predetermined communication types may include fax, video,

voice, or e-mail communication type (col. 6, lines 40-50). Also, Despres teaches the network

sending a voice message to the terminal (col. 3, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to a

person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Trent's teaching

of communication types may include fax, video, voice or email and Despres's teaching of the

network sending a voice message to the terminal into Lee's system in order to allow a system or

a user to have more choices in communication with other users or another system.

As to claim 23, Lee discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 17, except

the claimed limitation "wherein the broadcast system distributes the access numbers by a

combination of fax, email, and voice mail". However, Trent teaches that address book

application program maintains an address book information file, which contains a default list of

default client communication application programs. The default list specifies a default client

communication application program for each of a predetermined set of communication types.

For example, predetermined communication types may include fax, video, voice, or e-mail

communication type (col. 6, lines 40-50). Also, Despres teaches the network sending a voice

message to the terminal (col. 3, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to a person of an

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Trent's teaching of

communication types may include fax, video, voice or email and Despres's teaching of the

network sending a voice message to the terminal into Lee's system in order to allow a system

or a user to have more choices in communication with other users or another system.

Conclusion

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wray et al (USP 6442696).

Contact Information

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam-Y Truong whose telephone number is (703-605-1169). The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu, can be reached on (703-305-4393). The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703-764-7646).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703-305-3900).

CY

4/1/03

JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER